

Serial No. 10/072,037  
13 Apr 2005 Reply to  
12 Jan 2005 Office Action

### Remarks

After the foregoing amendment, claims 1 – 6, 8 – 23, and 25 – 39 are pending, with claims 1, 20, 36, and 38 being the independent claims. Claims 7 and 24 have been cancelled. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims in view of the above amendment and the following remarks.

#### *Claim Objections*

Claim 16 is objected to because of informalities in the claim language. The claim has been amended accordingly and Applicant respectfully requests that the objection be withdrawn.

#### *35 USC §112*

Pending claims 2, 12, 13, 15, 16, 29, 30, 32, 33, and 36 stand rejected under section 112 for lacking antecedent basis or being indefinite. Applicant has amended each rejected claim to provide antecedent basis where necessary and remove the “such as” language rendering claims 15 and 32 indefinite. Applicant asserts that none of these claim amendments are narrowing amendments in view of Festo.

#### *35 USC §102*

Claims 1, 5 – 7, 9 – 14, 20 – 24, 26 – 31, and 36 – 39 stand rejected under section 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002/0147,805 (“Leshem”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. With respect to independent claims 1, 20, 36 and 38, Leshem does not fairly teach or disclose the claimed invention. Leshem teaches the use of conventional web page log tracking as disclosed in the cited passages at paragraphs 179, 199, 200, and 202. This does not teach the claimed request that includes a request to record link-tracking information in a link-tracking file.

As Leshem describes in paragraph 201:

By way of background, standard Web servers commonly maintain server access log files (“log files”) which include information about accesses to the Web site by users. These files are typically maintained in one of two standard formats: the HTTP Server Access Log File format, or the HTTP Server Referrer Log File format. (Both of these formats are commonly used by Web servers available from Microsoft, Netscape, and NSCA, and both formats are supported by the Analysis Tool.) Each entry (line) in a log file represents a successful access to the associated Web site, and contains various information about the access event. This information normally includes: the path to the accessed URL, an identifier of the user (typically in the form of an IP address), and the date and time of the

Serial No. 10/072,037  
13 Apr 2005 Reply to  
12 Jan 2005 Office Action

access. Each log file stored on a physical server typically represents some window of time, such as one month. (Paragraph 201).

It is these conventional log files that Leshem uses to track user actions. For example:

An important feature of the Analysis Tool is its the ability to track user (visitor) activity and behavior patterns with respect to a Web site and to graphically display this information (using color coding, annotations, etc.) on the site map. In the preferred embodiment, this feature is implemented in-part by the Action Tracker plug-in, which gathers user activity data by retrieving and analyzing server log files commonly maintained by Web servers. (Paragraph 199).

Leshem does not teach or disclose that a request that includes a request to record link-tracking information in a link-tracking file is sent to a link tracking server. To the contrary, Leshem relies on conventional web server log files commonly maintained by web servers. These conventional log files are not maintained by requests that include a request to record link-tracking information in a link-tracking file. These conventional log files are instead maintained through the programmed functionality of the web server itself. No request including a request to record link-tracking information in a link-tracking file is either inherently required by conventional web server logging or described by Leshem.

Furthermore, Leshem does not disclose that the request is originally contained in a web page. Alternative embodiments of such a request contained in a web page are shown in figures 2A – 2B and 4A – 4B. These figures and their corresponding descriptions together illustrate exemplary embodiments of a request that is contained in a tracking-enabled web page. Leshem does not teach such a request that is contained in a tracking-enabled web page.

In summary, the claimed inventions in independent claims 1, 20, 36 and 38 each require that a request is sent to a link-tracking server and that the request includes a request to record link-tracking information in a link-tracking file. The general log functions of a web server disclosed by Leshem do not teach this aspect of the invention. Furthermore, the claimed inventions in independent claims 1, 20, 36 and 38 each require that the request is originally contained in a web page. Nowhere does Leshem describe including a request in a tracking-enabled web page. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Leshem does not teach the claimed invention as set forth in independent claim 1.

Serial No. 10/072,037  
13 Apr 2005 Reply to  
12 Jan 2005 Office Action

**35 USC §103**

The cited secondary references do not overcome the failings of Leshem to teach the inventions as set forth in the independent claims. Accordingly, it is axiomatic that the dependent claims are also presently in condition for allowance and a notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding the above Amendments and Remarks, the Examiner is respectfully urged to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,  
Procopio, Cory, Hargreaves & Savitch LLP

Dated: April 13, 2005

By: 

Patric J. Rawlins  
Reg. No. 47,887

Procopio, Cory, Hargreaves & Savitch LLP  
530 B Street, Suite 2100  
San Diego, California 92101-4469  
(619) 238-1900